

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Timeline – Internal Draft 7-31-2018

Nov, 1995	Parcel A: Record of Decision (No Further Action)
1999	Parcel A: Removed from EPA National Priorities List
2002	EPA Rad Scanner Van Survey
Feb, 2004	Parcel A: Former worker alleged Ra-226 contaminated storm drains ignored by Navy (SF Chronicle reported allegation May, 2018)
Summer, 2004	Parcel A: Tetra Tech EC Inc. (TTEC) tested, demolished Bldg 322, EPA scanned and found clean
Oct, 2004	Sitewide: Historical Radiological Assessment Parcel A: Final FOST, after several carve-outs due to discoveries of concerns
Dec, 2004	Parcel A: Transferred to the City/County of San Francisco
2006	Earliest TTEC data quality problems, e.g. missing scan data in final reports Earliest year of wrongdoing, as alleged by former workers of TTEC 7/2017
2008	Navy switched from time-and-materials to fixed-price contracts. Former workers alleged that soil sample swapping began.
Oct, 2012	Navy asked TTEC about K-40 anomalies, a sign of falsification
April, 2014	TTEC report showing resampled K-40 anomalies, excavated more contamination, concluded issues were limited and already resolved.
Feb, 2016	NRC Notice of Apparent Violation – 2 workers swapped samples at 10-15 locations in Parcel C, deliberately underrepresented contamination
Mar, 2016	NCB news former worker (Anthony Smith) allegations
Mar, 2016	EPA wrote to Navy to recommend investigation into potential immediate health threats, Superfund referral to Criminal Investigation Division
Jul, 2016	EPA, DTSC, RWQCB told Navy verbally no further transfers until resolve falsification
Sep, 2016	EPA, DTSC letter to Navy saying above
Oct, 2016	EPA written recommendations to Navy to begin sampling right away at priority locations
Dec, 2016	EPA refined written recommendations for the same (Enrique signed)
Jan, 2017	Navy proposal to do statistical radiological data evaluation. EPA response that statistical analysis does not confirm any given data are not necessarily falsified, recommend do not delay resampling.
May – Aug, 2017	Navy suggests 12 mrem/yr, Area Averaging. EPA shows inconsistent with EPA written policy, past practice at this and other EPA sites.
Sep 30, 2017	Navy draft Parcel B & G soil reports, showed 14 – 50% unreliable data
Oct 21, 2017	EPA email showing 97% survey units in Parcel G show unreliable data (3 weeks later)
Nov 1, 2017	Navy agrees to resample all survey units, but to re-excavate a small subset.
Nov 6, 2017	EPA proposes “proveout” path forward (less than 1 week later)
Dec 19, 2017	Navy gives counter-proposal that includes Area Averaging and resampling much smaller subset of parcels.
Dec 21, 2017	EPA again states more prove-out needed, rejects area averaging, etc. (2 days later)
Dec 29, 2017	Formal letter estimates data unreliable 97% Parcel G, 90% of Parcel B
Jan, 2018	Health Physicists 2 day mtg on site.
Feb 9, 2018	Navy draft generic Workplan for any parcel
Feb 16, 2018	Navy, EPA, DTSC, CDPH senior management present full path forward (1 week later)
Mar 26, 2018	EPA written comments on draft Workplan (5 weeks later)
April 16, 2018	Navy Clarification proposal – 12 mrem/yr, area averaging again
May 2, 2018	EPA informs Navy that EPA HQ (Jim Woolford) rejected clarification (3 weeks later)
June, 2018	Navy draft Workplan Parcel G
Aug 14, 2018	Comments due to Navy from EPA and public